



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,995	12/09/2002	Muhammed Majeed		6671

33048 7590 10/06/2004
SABINSA CORPORATION
121 ETHEL ROAD WEST, UNIT 6
PISCATAWAY, NJ 08854

EXAMINER

LEITH, PATRICIA A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1654

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/065,995	Applicant(s) MAJEED ET AL.	
	Examiner Patricia Leith	Art Unit 1654	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 6-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 6-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 December 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1 and 6-21 are pending in the application.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Group III, claims 6-21 in the reply filed on 4/16/04 is acknowledged as well as the election of the specie of supercritical extract, tetrahydrocurcumin, rosemary and avobenzone are acknowledged . Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim 1 is thus withdrawn from consideration on the merits as this claim is directed toward a non-elected invention. Further, because claims 8-10 and 12-14 are solely drawn to the non-elected species, these claims are also withdrawn from further consideration on the merits.

Claims 6, 7 11 and 15-21 were examined on the merits.

Specification

The use of the trademark CARBOPOL has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Objections

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 6 has a period added after the recitation of glabridin on line 6. This period improperly splits the claim apart. Claims are required to be only one sentence in length.

Claim 11 states 'one or more of the following extracts: rosemary extract.....Withania somnifera extract, tomato extract'. There should properly be an 'or' prior to the recitation of 'tomato extract' in order for the claim to be grammatically correct.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 6, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "such as" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 6 recites the broad recitation 0.1% to 3%, and the claim also recites 0.1%-0.5% which is the narrower statement of

Art Unit: 1654

the range/limitation and also line 7 recites the broad recitation 0.1% to about 5% and then the claim recites 0.1% to about 0.5% which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim 6 contains a period in the middle of the claim. The metes and bounds of the claim language cannot be clearly determined, because it cannot be absolutely ascertained if the subject matter appearing after the period is actually a part of the claim language.

Claim 18 states 'hyperpigmentation, melasma, age spots, freckles'. It is unclear if this phrase means A, B, C or D or alternatively, A, B, C and D. Correction is necessary.

Claim 19 states 'blemishes/black heads'. It is unclear if Applicants mean 'blemishes or blackheads' or 'blemishes and blackheads'.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 6, 7 11 and 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kyrou et al. (US 6,641,845 B1).

Kyrou et al. disclosed a topical skin whitening composition which preferably contained glabridin from licorice, tetrahydrocurcumin, rosemary extract, sunscreens such as oxybenzone or Uvinul MC80 and sunscreen boosters such as ethylhexyl p-methoxy cinnamates (see Abstract, col.2, lines 44-57, col.4, lines 17-24, col.3, lines 38-48 and col.6, lines 1-34). Because this composition was applied to the skin it is deemed that the methods of claims 18-21 would have intrinsically occurred due to the application of the product. It is further clear from Example 2 that the composition was in a cream form, since the composition contained thickeners as well as emollients (col.7).

Kyrou et al. did not specifically teach the specific amounts as instantly claimed.

It has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 220 F2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233; 235 (CCPA 1955). see MPEP § 2144.05 part II A. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicants' invention was made to determine all operable and optimal concentrations of components because concentration is an art-recognized result-effective variable which would have been routinely determined and optimized in the pharmaceutical art. Further, if there are any differences between Applicant's claimed method and that suggested by the combined teaching of the prior art, the differences would be appear minor in nature. Although the prior art do not teach all the various permutations of concentration ranges as claimed it would be conventional and within the skill of the art to identify the optional concentrations of a given ingredient because variations of components in nutritional compositions were well known in the art. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have modified the proportions of active ingredients in the topical composition in order to enable the content of the preparation to be matched with the demands and needs of individuals which needed treatment. Such variations in amounts of pharmaceutically active ingredients is considered merely optimization of result effective variables, conventional practice in the art of pharmacology.

Art Unit: 1654

From the teachings of the references, it is apparent that one of ordinary skill in the art would have had a reasonable expectation of success in producing the claimed invention. Therefore, the invention as a whole was *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, as evidenced by the references, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

No Claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia Leith whose telephone number is (571) 272-0968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patricia Leith
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1654

09/22/04

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Patricia Leith", written in a cursive style.